



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,719	07/02/1999	ANA GABRIELA ANAYA	09857/018001	2808
26161	7590	01/27/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			BASHORE, ALAIN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
DATE MAILED: 01/27/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/346,719

Applicant(s)

ANAYA ET AL.

Examiner

Alain L. Bashore

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 53-54 recite "system" which is vague and indefinite since a system may be one of several different statutory classes of invention (including a method or an apparatus). Applicant must indicate on the record what statutory class of invention the system claims belong to. For the purposes of this examination these claims are considered apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 44-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of (Zusman et al and Kampe et al) in further view of Lange.

Wilson discloses market event data received by a plurality of feed lines (fig 1) which is then translated into common formats (col 2, lines 38-44; col 6, lines 61-67; col 7, lines 1-7; col 7, lines 39-55). Mechanisms (fig 1) receive the data after it has been processed by a gateway (1) which is then disseminated. A private network is disclosed (col 4, lines 5-16).

Wilson also discloses placing time data on incoming messages as a means of accurately identifying and flagging messages for later processing (col 6, lines 45 et seq) and to provide an platform compatibility to facilitate network communications over disparate network architectures and protocols (col 4, lines 1 et seq).

Wilson discloses market session data (col 5, lines 4-10), line (col 5, lines 60-67; col 6, lines 1-4), feed (col 4, lines 52-59), message type (col 6, lines 52-67), and original identification (col 5, lines 26-32).

Since the mechanisms to Wilson include processors that manipulate data, there are "engines" present. Since the data disseminated allows for informing a recipient there is present "alerts". Since the gateway disclosed by Wilson allows movement of data, there is present "validation". Since data is disseminated there is present "publishing".

Since Wilson's gateway describes processing constrains (col 7, lines 10-14) and use of a buffer (col 6, lines 5-11), there must be present data with FIFO constraints, thus market event data in a "queue".

Wilson does not disclose:

attaching timing data to the received message, including time extracted from the received message, and a stamp indicating receipt time at the receiver object and other data;

activating a function to translate received message into market event data;

receiving in an object or activation of objects to perform recited functions – i.e. the use of object oriented language (as now claimed in claims 44, 53, and 55);

a stamp indicating a receipt time at the receiver function;

time comparison of messages as recited in claims 45, 54, and 56;

sequence number registration or updating;

validation of market event data with: gap data, duplicate message discarding/tracking; and,

fields within a market event object format.

Zusman et al discloses translating a portion of received messages into messages having a common format (col 6, lines 26-31).

Kampe et al discloses market event data as received messages (col 1, lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to translate received messages into market event messages to Wilson because of what is taught by Kampe et al and Zusman et al.

Kampe et al teaches that received messages having market event data must be continuously updated in a synchronous and compatible fashion (col 1, lines 20-67; col 2, lines 1-36). Zusman et al teaches accuracy and timeliness of financial data (col 2, lines 5-10) including standardization of message formats for delivery purposes (col 6, lines 25-42).

Zusman et al discloses a time stamp (col 9, line 8) for input messages, time comparison of blocks of messages (col 9, lines 19-22), sequence number registration and updating (col 10, line 11), validation of market event data with: gap data (col 9, lines 28-29), duplicate message discarding/tracking (col 9, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include sequence number registration and updating because Zusman et al teaches assigning sequence numbers for the purposes of message validation (col 10, lines 9-11) and updating for purposes of data manipulation (col 15, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include validation of market event data with: gap data and duplicate message

discarding/tracking because Zusman et al teaches such for purposes of message consistency requirements (col 9, line 18).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a stamp for a receipt time to Wilson because Zusman et al teaches that a stamp is a conventional header for input messages (col 9, lines 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include time comparisons as recited in claims 45, 54, and 56 because Zusman et al teaches correction by requesting re-submission if data included with the message is inconsistent with protocol (col 9, lines 22-34).

Wilson in view of (Zusman et al and Kampe et al) does not further disclose:

receiving in an object or activation objects to perform functions – i.e. the use of object oriented language.

Lange discloses the use of object-oriented language (col 90, lines 35-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include object or activation objects to perform functions because of what is taught by Lange. Lange teaches as common for servers that receive market data to utilize object oriented techniques (col 90 , lines 42-44).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include fields within a market event object format because Kampe et al describes messages as inherently having information within fields (col 5, line 13).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 11-19-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The use of object orientation for the claimed invention would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art as explained in the office action.

The use of the recitation "publish" and "alert" is deemed to be encompassed by the prior art as described in the office action.

The claims as recited do preclude the use of formatting or the use of servers. Object orientation itself per se is known in the art as a type of formatting.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 703-308-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (Monday thru Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.


Alain L. Bashore